

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/586,628	06/05/2000	Benjamin Chu	178-289	7768
23869	7590 07/16/2003			
HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP			EXAMINER	
6900 JERICH SYOSSET, N	IO TURNPIKE IY 11791		EGWIM, KELECHI CHIDI	
			ART UNIT .	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	7
			DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003	7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	·		AS				
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/586,628	CHU ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim	1713				
Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication app eply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
THE MAIL - Extensions after SIX (6 - If the perio - If NO perio - Failure to r - Any reply n	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (b) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If or reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply d for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we eply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, exceived by the Office later than three months after the mailing ent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) diviil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro cause the application to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1)⊠ Re	esponsive to communication(s) filed on 05 A	<u>//ay 2003</u> .					
2a)⊠ Th	is action is FINAL . 2b) Thi	is action is non-final.					
clo	nce this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	prosecution as to the merits is 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition o							
4) Claim(s) 1-10,28 and 29 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>28 and 29</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	•						
	6) Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.						
· <u> </u>	im(s) is/are objected to. im(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r alastian requirement					
Application i		election requirement.					
9) <u></u> The	specification is objected to by the Examiner	•,					
	drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep		aminer.				
Ap	plicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11) The	proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) <u></u> The	oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.	· .				
Pri rity unde	r 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)∐ A	Ⅱ b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bur he attached detailed Office action for a list of the action for	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_				
14) Ackn	owledgment is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(e) (to a provisional application).				
	The translation of the foreign language pro owledgment is made of a claim for domesti						
Attachment(s)							
2) Notice of D	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) n Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informa	rry (PTO-413) Paper No(s) I Patent Application (PTO-152)				
J.S. Patent and Tradema	rk Office						

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claims 28 and 29 are directed to an invention that is
independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:
Claims 28 and 29 are to methods for separating charged species while the examined
claims are to a polymer solution.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 28 and 29 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over by Dubrow, Madabhushi et al. or Hooper et al., for reasons cited in the previous action.

Application/Control Number: 09/586,628 Page 3

Art Unit: 1713

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubrow, Madabhushi et al. or Hooper et al, for reasons cited in the previous action.

Response to Arguments

- 6. Applicant's arguments filed 5/5/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 7. Regarding applicant's arguments against the 102 rejection over Dubrow, Madabhushi et al. or Hooper et al., firstly, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a polymer solution prepared by polymerizing a second polymer in a matrix of a first polymer) are not recited in these rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claims call for an interpenetrating network of different polymers in solution and a true mixture of two compatible polymers in solution is inherently interpenetrating/intertwined.

Application/Control Number: 09/586,628 Page 4

Art Unit: 1713

Secondly, the fact that Dubrow teaches approaches for elimination electrophoendoosmotic flow does not mean that the polymer(s) do not suppress electrophoendoosmotic flow to start with. Substantial elimination is a greater, and in this case supplemental, level of control than suppression. Also, polyethylene oxide, taught in Dubrow, is one of the "silica-absorbing polymers" recited in the present claim 7.

Finally, the teaching in Hooper et al. that the viscosity of the polymers in solution is thermally reversible does not exclude them from the present polymers in solution.

As such, the requirements for rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) are met.

8. Regarding the 102/103 rejection of claims 8-10, as stated above, the mixtures of compatible polymers in solution would certainly form a network and be interpenetration. It is still reasonable that the network of these very same polymers would posses the disclosed entanglement properties and base read lengths.

Therefore, claims 8-10 are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubrow, Madabhushi et al. or Hooper et al.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1713

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim whose telephone number is (703) 306-5701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (703) 308-2450. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

KCF

July 14, 2003